

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-21 were previously presented. A similar feature to that contained in claims 18-21 is amended herein into independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 11. Therefore, claims 18-21 are cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 3-12 and 14-17, all the claims presently pending in the application. It should be noted that the Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 3-12 and 14-17, prior to this Amendment, is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 3-12 and 14-17 are amended solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 3-12 and 14-17, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-17 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As these claims have been cancelled the rejection is now moot. However, since a similar feature to that contained in claims 18-21 has been amended into independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 11, please consider the following.

The Office Action supported the §112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 18-21 because "The new claims 18-21 recite "said allocating of said resource usage comprises at least one of evenly splitting said overlapping usage between said two different service requests and said overlapping

usage in a weighted manner ... " There two problems. One is that "said overlapping usage" and "said two different service requests" lack antecedent basis. This leads to the second issue, which is, if one has overlapping requests as required by the independent claims, it is contrary to the requirement of "said two different service requests". For the purposes of examination, the examiner will consider the new claims to cover the concept that usage overlaps, but the requests do not. From paragraph [0020]."

Both problems discussed by the Examiner, have been addressed in the amendments to the independent claims. Specifically, the independent claims now refer to "allocating overlapping usage of the computer between at least two overlapping service requests, the overlapping service requests being from different users, by one of evenly splitting the overlapping usage between the overlapping service requests and splitting the overlapping usage in a weighted manner based upon respective durations of the overlapping service requests". Thus, there are not antecedent basis issues. Furthermore, the claim language clarifies that it is covering both overlapping usage and overlapping service requests.

Support for such claim language is found in paragraphs [0022]-[0025] of the specification. That is, paragraph [0022] indicates that there may be situations where multiple users attempt to access the same service at the same time. This could be handled in two different ways. As discussed in paragraph [0023], referencing Figure 2, in the first case sequential servicing is provided such that usage may overlap, but not requests. However, alternatively, as discussed in paragraphs [0024]-[0025] which references Figure 3, the system can be configured to handle both overlapping usage and overlapping requests from different users. Table 1 within

the specification further provides an algorithm suitable for dividing the resource usage between different overlapping requests.

II. The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Halliday, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0083003), hereinafter referred to as Halliday. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited prior art reference does not teach or suggest the following feature of amended independent claim 1 or the similar features in amended independent claims 9, 10 or 11: (1) “metering use of network-accessible computer resources by multiple users of the computer resources during a same time period”; (2) “recording, as process accounting information, the use of the computer resources for a plurality of processes that relate to service requests made by the users;” (3) “recording service request information for the service requests made by the users; (4) “correlating the recorded process accounting information and the recorded service request information;” and (5) “providing resource usage information for each of the service requests for each of the users based upon the correlated recorded process accounting information and the recorded service request information, said providing comprising allocating overlapping usage of the computer resources between at least two overlapping service requests, the overlapping service requests being from different users, by one of evenly splitting the overlapping usage between the overlapping service requests and splitting the overlapping usage in a weighted manner based upon respective durations of the overlapping service requests.”

The claimed invention provides metering of the use of network-accessible computer

resources by multiple users requesting services. More specifically, process accounting information is recorded, together with service request logs written by e-service applications. These two sets of information are aggregated and correlated, to generate usage metrics relating to resource usage for individual service requests. Specifically, a correlator uses a heuristic procedure to allocate the overlapping usage of resources between requests, which may also be overlapping. Such per-request information can be used as a basis for charging users making such requests.

Generally, the Office Action asserts that the prior art of record discloses all of the features of the claimed invention. However, nothing within Halliday mentions metering of the use of network-accessible computer resources by multiple users requesting services. Rather Halliday relates to the field of software licensing, and more specifically, to a system for providing centralized time based charging and/or metering of an application by a user on the user's own computer (see paragraph [0003]). Specifically, as discussed in paragraph [0053] of Halliday, an application is downloaded by a user or otherwise obtained by the user for use on his own computer. All software usage by the user is then metered on the client system and this metered usage is reported to a metering server located in a host site where the software usage is accounted for and charged. Metering can include determining if the user is authorized to run the application and stopping the application if authorization is not found (see paragraph [0075]).

In the Office Action, on page 4, the Examiner asserts that the "applications" of Halliday are equated to the service requests of the present invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, as mentioned above, in Halliday an application is downloaded or installed on a user's own computer and the user's use of this locally-installed application is monitored (also referred to in Halliday as metering) so that the user can be charged. No "service request" is made by the user for the use of network-accessible computer resources. Consequently, in Halliday there is no recording of the use of computer resources for a plurality of processes that relate to service requests made by users and also no recording of service request information for such service requests made by users. Additionally, because there are no service requests, there is no correlating of recorded process accounting information and recorded service request information and no providing of resource usage information for each service request for each of user based upon such correlated recorded process accounting and service request information. There is only logging and reporting out of the actual use by a user of a locally-installed application. Furthermore, it should be noted that in the present application network-accessible computer resources can be used simultaneously to execute multiple service requests from multiple users, whereas in Halliday a single locally-installed application on a client computer is operated by a single user logged onto the client computer.

In the Office Action, on page 5, the Examiner further asserts that "Page 5, paragraph [0077] [of Halliday] shows overlapping requests, includes active lists, it then checks at 9B for the existence of another metering monitor running on the same client computer using the same the configuration file. If such a metering monitor exists, the newly started monitor quits." The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, paragraph [0077] refers to Figure 9 which presents an overall depiction of the metering monitor's function. The first step performed by a metering monitor on a client's

computer is to read the computer's configuration file. If it determines that another metering monitor is running on the same computer, it quits. Otherwise, it registers its identity and the identify of the computer with the billing site's metering server. This paragraph does not disclose overlapping requests, just the potential that a single client computer may have multiple metering monitors that can report to the billing site's metering server, but only one such monitor will run at a time.

The Office Action further cites a Webster's dictionary definition of the word "allocate" and indicates "Multiple clients are using vendor code (a computing resource), which means that vendor code has been set apart for their use or vendor code is being allocated for each client. Because the system has a means for disabling the code, it can refuse to allocate resource usage. The overlapping request is addressed above. The system uses a pool of features in order to provide an application. A feature is an atomic chargeable unit of functionality. It is in this way the overlapping usage or features used in more than one application can be allocated for different applications or service requests." The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Specifically, paragraph [0056]-[0057] of Halliday indicates that applications are executed and, as the applications execute, "vendor code calls to the client library to indicate that features are in use". The library will forward this information to a metering monitor. The metering monitor will then associate this application on the client's computer with a server account via the map of logged-in users and forward the information to the billing site's metering server (i.e., the logon process maps the local user on the client computer to an account held in a remote database, and such account will be charged as usage of an application is accumulated). While paragraph [0057], mentions the term "vendor code" in this context, it is not mentioned or explained

anywhere else in the Halliday specification. Based on the context in paragraph [0057], Halliday simply discloses that a vendor code is located on each client application and this vendor code is used to call “the client library to indicate that features are in use”. Nothing in the specification indicates that vendor code is set apart or allocated for use by multiple users, as indicated in the Office Action. Furthermore, nothing in the specification refers to allocating overlapping usage of computer resources, much less to the claimed feature of “allocating overlapping usage of the [network-accessible] computer resources between at least two overlapping service requests, the overlapping service requests being from different users, by one of evenly splitting the overlapping usage between the overlapping service requests and splitting the overlapping usage in a weighted manner based upon respective durations of the overlapping service requests.”

Therefore, the Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1, 9, 10, and 11 are patentable over the cited prior art reference. Furthermore, dependent claims 3-8 and 12-17 are similarly patentable, not only by virtue of their dependency from a patentable independent claim, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

III. Formal Matters and Conclusion

With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-12, and 14-17, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior

art of record and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims and further to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 14, 2008

/Pamela M. Riley/
Pamela M. Riley
Registration No. 40,146

Gibb & Rahman, LLC
2568-A Riva Road, Suite 304
Annapolis, MD 21401
Voice: (410) 573-0227
Fax: (301) 261-8825
Customer Number: 29154